



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE COSTS OF ADMINISTERING THE LEAGUE

In reporting to the French Parliament upon the national budget, M. Nobelmaire discussed frankly the costs that were piling up for France, owing to her share in the administrative costs of the League of Nations, and the effect of his statements have been reflected in the proceedings of the Assembly at Geneva, where France has led in a determined effort to reduce the amount of money to be spent by the League, France insisting that the salaries paid are much too high, and that the offices and working plant of the League in Geneva are much too luxurious.

M. Nobelmaire insisted that the League should have a special controlling body, charged with supervision of the League's expenditures and auditing its accounts. He cited that in the first six months of its existence the League had cost 10,000,000 francs in gold, and that the third budget approved by the Council, that was to come before the Assembly in Geneva, called on France to pay 2,700,000 francs into the League treasury during 1921. He showed that the secretarial staff alone cost the signatory States more than 8,000,000 francs during the first six months of the League's life. The Brussels Conference cost the League 1,500,000 francs, and the International Labor Bureau had incurred expenses amounting to 8,000,000 francs and was asking for an enlarged staff, while for the work of the League as a whole its secretariat was proposing a "working fund" of 4,000,000 francs. Inasmuch as many parliaments of the signatory powers had not met the financial responsibilities involved in their membership in the League, M. Nobelmaire showed how the League had been forced to become a debtor and to borrow funds for its running expenses. His plea is for stricter accounting, more severe economy in administration, and all possible effort to save the League secretariat from becoming a bureaucracy. France, he said, must stand for this broader policy, if it is to stay in the League and to pay its share. Any other policy would be folly, in the light of the plight of the national treasury and credit.

THE ASSEMBLY'S REACTIONS

This problem of keeping the administrative expenses of the League within bounds came before the meeting of the Assembly at Geneva quite early in the sessions, and at times took on quite an acrimonious form of debate, with specific charges against the extravagance of the salaries paid the secretariat and the status of splendor in which the League's officials are housed, etc. French, Swedish, and Canadian champions of economy were conspicuous, and the net effect of the debate was to make temporary appointment of commissions to do specific tasks for the League rather than to set up new permanent commissions, as had been recommended by the administrative officials at Berne and by the Council. The Argentina Republic's representatives, after they withdrew from the Assembly, announced that the Republic would not be liable for further assessments.

NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS, 1919-1920

The Storthing of Norway, functioning in accord with the terms of the bequest of Alfred Nobel, has awarded two peace prizes, one for 1919 to M. Leon Bourgeois, the eminent French promoter of international arbitral and judicial relations and a representative of France in the Council of the

League of Nations, and the other—for 1920—to President Wilson.

The latter, in instructing the American Minister to Norway to accept on his behalf the award of the Storthing, wrote:

In accepting the honor of your award, I am moved not only by a profound gratitude for the recognition of my earnest efforts in the cause of peace, but also by a very poignant humility before the vastness of the work still called for by this cause.

May I not take this occasion to express my respect for the farsighted wisdom of the founder in arranging for a continuing system of awards?

If there were but one such prize, or if this were to be the last, I could not, of course, accept it. For mankind has not yet been rid of the unspeakable horror of war. I am convinced that our generation has, despite its wounds, made notable progress. But it is the better part of wisdom to consider our work as only begun. It will be a continuing labor. In the indefinite course of years before us, there will be abundant opportunity for others to distinguish themselves in the crusade against hate and fear and war.

There is, indeed, a peculiar fitness in the grouping of these Nobel awards. The Cause of Peace and the Cause of Truth are of one family. Even as those who love science and devote their lives to physics or chemistry, even as those who would create new and higher ideals for mankind in literature, even so with those who love peace, there is no limit set. Whatever has been accomplished in the past is petty compared to the glory and promise of the future.

PRIZE ESSAYS ON PEACE THEMES

The American School Citizenship League, formerly the American School Peace League, in announcing its 1920-1921 prize essay contest, again opens the competition to students of all countries. One contest is for seniors in normal schools. The theme on which competitors will write will be, "What education can do to secure co-operation as against competition between nations." The other contest is open to seniors in secondary schools, and the theme is, "The essential foundations of a co-operating world." Three prizes of \$75, \$50, and \$25 will be given for the best three essays in each set. The judges, of whom there are eight, are educators prominent in normal-school and high-school work, and the list is headed by Paul Monroe, director of the School of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York City. Essays must not exceed 5,000 words in length; must be accompanied by a topical outline, and preferably be in type-writing. They should be sent to Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, Secretary of the League, 405 Marlborough Street, not later than June 21, 1921. One of the prize-winners in the 1919-20 contest lives in England, and the other prize-winners were from Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE MESOPOTAMIAN MANDATE

On November 26 the following communication from the Secretary of State of the United States to the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was made public, without the series of five which had preceded it. The full text of the correspondence, giving the British side of the case, is soon to appear in a White Book.

Mr. Colby, the representative of the United States, wrote:

NOVEMBER 20, 1920.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON, K. G.,
His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

MY LORD: I have the honor to refer to your note of August 9 regarding the application of the principle of equality of treatment to the territories of the Near East to be placed under mandates, and specifically to the petroleum resources of those territories as affected by that principle.

Before considering the observations of His Majesty's Government on the general principles advocated by the United States, and agreed to by the allied powers, for application to the mandates over former Turkish territory, as outlined in the notes of May 12 and July 28, addressed to you on behalf of this government, I think it will clarify the discussion to indicate certain of your statements and assurances which this government has been pleased to receive. Thus, I note that the assignment to Great Britain of the mandate for Mesopotamia was made and accepted subject to no friendly arrangement whatever with any third government regarding economic rights, which, of course, would have been wholly at variance with the purpose and contemplation of any mandate.

It is also gratifying to learn His Majesty's Government is in full sympathy with the several propositions formulated in the note of May 12, above referred to, which embody or illustrate the principles which this government believes should be applied in the mandated regions, and which are essential to the practical realization of equality of treatment.

The statements of your note, to the effect that the British Government has refrained from exploiting the petroleum resources of the mandated territories in question; that the operations referred to have been conducted for purely military purposes under the immediate supervision of the army authorities and at army expense; and that no private interests whatever are in any way involved, are accepted with a full sense of the good faith of the British Government.

Assurances of Britain

The Government of the United States notes that His Majesty's Government has found it necessary to suspend, during the period of occupation, the grant of facilities and opportunities to British as well as to other private interests to investigate the natural resources of the country, either for the purpose of acquiring new claims or strengthening old ones, and that there is no reason for assuming that the administration either of Mesopotamia or of Palestine has at any time failed to carry out the assurances of His Majesty's Government.

This government welcomes your pledges to the effect that the natural resources of Mesopotamia are to be secured to the people of Mesopotamia and to the future Arab State, to be established in that region, and that it is the purpose of the British Government, fully alive to its obligation as a temporary occupant, not only to secure those resources to the Mesopotamian State, but also its absolute freedom of action in the control thereof, and in particular that it is far from the intention of the mandatory power to establish any kind of monopoly or preferred position in its own interest.

The Government of the United States appreciates, likewise, the concurrence with its view that the merits of all claims to rights alleged to have been acquired in the mandated territories before the outbreak of hostilities must be duly established before recognition of such claims will be accorded.

Adverting, at this point, to the views of His Majesty's Government regarding the nature of the responsibilities of mandatory powers under the League of Nations, I desire to call to the attention of His Majesty's Government the fact that while the draft mandate, Form A, was not adopted at Paris, it was the understanding of the American representatives there present that the British Government entertained and had expressed convictions favorable to said form, and that, presumably, its representatives would exercise their influence in conformity with those convictions.

America for Equality

I need hardly refer again to the fact that the Government of the United States has consistently urged that it is of the utmost importance to the future peace of the world that alien territory transferred as a result of the war with the Central Powers should be held and administered in such a way as to assure equal treatment to the commerce and to the citizens of all nations. Indeed, it was in reliance upon an understanding to this effect, and expressly in contemplation thereof, that the United States was persuaded that the acquisition under mandate of certain enemy territory by the victorious powers would be consistent with the best interests of the world.

It is assumed, accordingly, that your statements with reference to Mandate A, together with the statement that the draft mandates for Mesopotamia and Palestine have been prepared with a view to secure equality of treatment for the commerce and citizens of all States which are members of the League of Nations, do not indicate a supposition on your part that the United States can be excluded from the benefits of that principle of equality of treatment.

This government is pleased to find that His Majesty's Government is in full sympathy with the principles formulated in its communications of May 12 and July 28. But it is unable to concur in the view, contained in paragraph 15 of your note, that the terms of the mandates can properly be discussed only in the Council of the League of Nations and by the signatories of the Covenant. Such powers as the allied and associated nations may enjoy, or wield, in the determination of the governmental status of the mandated areas, accrued to them as a direct result of the war against the Central Powers. The United States, as a participant in that conflict and as a contributor to its successful issue, cannot consider any of the associated powers, the smallest not less than itself, debarred from the discussion of any of its consequences, or from participation in the rights and privileges secured under the mandates provided for in the treaties of peace.

Notes to Go to League

This government notes with interest your statement that the draft mandates for Mesopotamia and for Palestine, which have been prepared with a view to secure equality of treatment and opportunity for the commerce, citizens, and subjects of all States which are members of the League of Nations, will, when approved by the interested allied powers, be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations. The United States is, undoubtedly, one of the powers directly interested in the terms of the mandates, and I therefore request that the draft mandate forms be communicated to this government for its consideration before their submission to the Council of the League. It is believed that His Majesty's Government will be the more ready to acquiesce in this request, in view of your assurance that His Majesty's Government is in full sympathy with the various principles contained in the two previous notes of this government upon this subject.

The establishment of the mandate principle, a new principle in international relations, and one in which the public opinion of the world is taking a special interest, would seem to require the frankest discussion from all pertinent points of view. It would seem essential that suitable publicity should be given to the drafts of mandates which it is the intention to submit to the Council, in order that the fullest opportunity may be afforded to consider their terms in relation to the obligations assumed by the mandatory power and the respective interests of all governments which are or deem themselves concerned or affected.

The fact cannot be ignored that the reported resources of Mesopotamia have interested public opinion of the United States, Great Britain, and other countries as a potential subject of economic strife. Because of that fact they become an outstanding illustration of the kind of economic question with reference to which the mandate principle was especially designed, and indeed a peculiarly critical test of the good faith of the nations which have given their adherence to the principle. This principle was accepted in the hope of obviating in the future those international differ-

ences that grow out of a desire for the exclusive control of the resources and markets of annexed territories. To cite a single example: Because of the shortage of petroleum, its constantly increasing commercial importance, and the continuing necessity of replenishing the world's supply by drawing upon the latent resources of undeveloped regions, it is of the highest importance to apply to the petroleum industry the most enlightened principles recognized by nations as appropriate for the peaceful ordering of their economic relations.

This government finds difficulty in reconciling the special arrangement referred to in paragraphs 18 and 19 of your note, and set forth in the so-called San Remo Petroleum Agreement, with your statement that the petroleum resources of Mesopotamia, and freedom of action in regard thereto, will be secured to the future Arab State, as yet unorganized. Furthermore, it is difficult to harmonize that special arrangement with your statement that concessionary claims relating to those resources still remain in their pre-war position, and have yet to receive, with the establishment of the Arab State, the equitable consideration promised by His Majesty's Government.

This government has noted in this connection a public statement of His Majesty's minister in charge of petroleum affairs to the effect that the San Remo agreement was based on the principle that the concessions granted by the former Turkish Government must be honored. It would be reluctant to assume that His Majesty's Government has already undertaken to pass judgment upon the validity of concessionary claims in the regions concerned, and to concede validity to certain of those claims which cover, apparently, the entire Mesopotamian area. Indeed, this government understands your note to deny having taken, and to deny the intention to take, any such *ex parte* and premature action. In this connection, I might observe that such information as this government has received indicates that prior to the war the Turkish Petroleum Company, to make specific reference, possessed in Mesopotamia no rights to petroleum concessions or to the exploitation of oil; and in view of your assurance that it is not the intention of the mandatory power to establish on its own behalf any kind of monopoly, I am at some loss to understand how to construe the provision of the San Remo agreement that any private petroleum company which may develop the Mesopotamian oil fields "shall be under permanent British control."

Question of Motives

Your lordship contracts the present production of petroleum in the United States with that of Great Britain and some allusion is made to American supremacy in the petroleum industry. I should regret any assumption by His Majesty's Government or any other friendly power that the views of this government as to the true character of a mandate are dictated in any degree by considerations of the domestic need or production of petroleum or any other commodity.

I may be permitted to say, however, for the purpose of correcting a misapprehension which your note reflects, that the United States possesses only one-twelfth approximately of the petroleum resources of the world. The oil resources of no other nation have been so largely drawn upon for foreign needs, and your lordship's statement that any prophecies as to the oil-bearing resources of unexplored and undeveloped countries must be accepted with reserve, hardly disposes of the scientific calculation upon which, despite their problematical elements, the policies of States and the anticipations of world production are apparently proceeding. The Government of the United States assumes that there is a general recognition of the fact that the requirements for petroleum are in excess of production, and it believes that opportunity to explore and develop the petroleum resources of the world wherever found should without discrimination be freely extended, as only by the unhampered development of such resources can the needs of the world be met.

But it is not these aspects of oil production and supply, in so far as they are of domestic interest to the United States, with which I am concerned in this discussion. I have alluded to them in order to correct confusing infer-

ences, liable to arise from certain departures, which I believe I discern in your lordship's communication, from the underlying principles of a mandate, as evolved and sought to be applied by the allied and associated powers to the territories, brought under their temporary dominion, by their joint struggle and common victory. This dominion will be wholly misconceived, not to say abused, if there is even the slightest deviation from the spirit and the exclusive purpose of a trusteeship as strict as it is comprehensive. Accept, My Lord, the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY,

Secretary of State of the United States of America.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

WAR CAUSES VAST MIGRATIONS of civilians and survivors of the fray. Denudation of home territory, wrecking of industries, scarcity of sustenance, and impending burdens of taxation if men remain where they are—these causes provoke emigration to more favored lands; and, as present figures show, nothing but difficulties in getting passports and transportation and the right to enter new lands across seas is preventing an exodus from Europe to the Americas such as never has been seen in the past. Much of this planned for transplanting of peoples will be state-sanctioned. The Poles, for instance, are only too glad to get rid of the hordes of Gallician Jews. Italy, with her past experience in mind, welcomes settlement of her sons abroad, knowing how much of their earnings comes back home. Germany has a surplus population of 12,000,000 to feed. All the governments wish to get rid of their diseased, crippled, and defective folk. Hence they expedite the exoduses.

To meet this incoming flood and check it, Canada, by an order in council, has just decreed that all artisans, mechanics, and laborers other than farm laborers seeking admission must possess \$250 in their own right and have transportation to their destination. Tourists, farmers, and domestic servants are not touched by the new regulation. Canada's restrictions always have been more rigid than those of the United States, and she has not had to face, as yet, any marked variation from colonization by North of Europe races, though Jews are growing in number rapidly in and about Montreal.

In the United States, the first day that Congress opened, December 6, the House Committee on Immigration reported favorably on a bill, introduced by its chairman, forbidding admission of aliens for two years, the bill to become effective 60 days after its enactment. Blood relatives of naturalized aliens are exempted.

The American Federation of Labor is supporting this restrictive legislation.

"CANCELLATION" OF ORDERS FOR GOODS has gone on to such a degree as between the merchants and manufacturers of different countries, and also within nations as between wholesalers and retailers, that the phenomenon has become a recognized form of war "by-product." The chancelleries of the nations are wrestling now with charges brought by one set of nationals against another group. The International Chamber of Commerce has been forced to deal with the problem, and the Chamber